

In re Application of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,205
Response to Final Office Action of February 7, 2008

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of February 7, 2008, which was made Final.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-17 were pending. As indicated above, claim 2 is being canceled, and new claims 18 and 19 are being added. Hence, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-19 will be pending.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Gong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,574). Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable over this reference.

As indicated above, independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 are being amended. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments are supported by at least the following paragraphs of the present application. Specifically, paragraph 0030 of the published present application describes “a control layer 5 forming part of the resources 6 for access to the network with which the terminal 2 is equipped.” Paragraph 0031 states that “[t]he control layer 5 verifies that certain properties are fulfilled by the frames transmitted by the a priori non-confidence applications,” and paragraph 0033 states that “the control layer 5 forces the requests originating from a priori non-confidence applications 4 to include a mark.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Gong does not teach the feature of a control layer included in network access resources of a first unit that examines and forces a request originating from an application to include a mark associated with an application family. Furthermore, Gong does not teach or suggest anything related to performing operations for checking the presence of a mark in requests and introducing, if necessary, such a mark in the requests.

Rather, in the Gong patent, a request originating from an applet must include some clue making it possible for the “relay server” 12 of the ISP Server system to detect whether

In re Application of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,205
Response to Final Office Action of February 7, 2008

the applet was signed or not. This detection is the basis for deciding whether the request should be routed to the recipient server 16 directly or after establishing special communication links. Gong does not provide any details about the structure or content of such a clue, but clearly the clue is inserted by the (signed or unsigned) applet itself.

Gong also fails to disclose or even suggest providing network access resources of a terminal or unit with a control layer as claimed. In the claimed embodiments of the present invention, the network access resources 6, as shown in Fig. 1 of the present application, interface with various kinds of applications including trusted and non-trusted applications, that is, applications with different degrees of confidence. The resources include a control layer 5 that ensures that request emanating from non-trusted applications include a special marking (as recited in amended claim 1) or do not include a special marking (as recited in amended claim 6). Applicants submit that the disclosure Gong describes nothing reasonably comparable to such a control layer. Applicants also submit that Gong teach away from this as it relates to a way of bypassing restrictions applying to non-signed applet.

In addition, Applicants submit the arguments presented in response to the first non-final action remain applicable to the current response.

Hence, for at least the above reasons, Gong does not anticipate the embodiments of the present invention as recited in the new set of independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 15. Accordingly, all claims should be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

In re Application of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,205
Response to Final Office Action of February 7, 2008

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One of Attorneys for Applicant(s)
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: May 7, 2008

CH02/ 22521462.1